



## MINUTES OF THE SOUTH OGDEN CITY COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 2016 – 6:00 P.M.  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL

### COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Mayor James Minster, Council Members Brent Strate, Sallee Orr, Bryan Benard, Russ Porter, and Adam Hensley

### STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

City Manager Matt Dixon, City Attorney Ken Bradshaw, Parks and Public Works Director Jon Andersen, Police Chief Darin Parke, Fire Chief Cameron West, Finance Director Steve Liebersbach, Assistant to the City Manager Doug Gailey, and Recorder Leesa Kapetanov

### CITIZENS PRESENT

Jim Pearce, Wesley Stewart, Jerry Cottrell, and Walt Bausman

## I. OPENING CEREMONY

### A. Call To Order

Mayor Minster called the meeting to order at 6:02 pm and entertained a motion to convene.

**Council Member Porter moved to convene as the South Ogden City Council, followed by a second from Council Member Benard. In a voice vote Council Members Strate, Orr, Benard, Porter and Hensley all voted aye.**

### B. Prayer/Moment Of Silence

The mayor invited everyone to participate in a moment of silence.

### C. Pledge Of Allegiance

Council Member Orr led everyone present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The mayor then opened the meeting for public comments, reminding everyone that no action would be taken on comments made that evening. He asked those who wanted to speak to limit their comments to three minutes.

## II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

**Wesley Stewart, 3625 Jefferson** – gave some handouts to the Council (see Attachment A). He said he was a resident who did not live in the area of the proposed Form Based Code, however due to the concern of some of his neighbors, he had started looking into it. He did not think it was fair to allow commercial development along Ogden and Adams Avenues and further along 40<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Stewart had made a list of several things in the Form Based Code that seemed to go against the 2008 General

Plan. He did not think the area along 40<sup>th</sup> Street should be so deep and said the construction trucks coming in and out of the area would be dangerous for the children there. He also pointed out a letter from McDonald's that said these type codes don't work out.

Mr. Stewart said the Form Based Code went against the General Plan because it said residents from the south wanted more commercial development and affordable housing near them, but the Form Based Code was in the north part of the city; he felt it should be in the south part of the city. He felt the reason the north end of the city was struggling was because of the low income people living there. The Form Based Code would make the property values go up, making it difficult for people to pay their property taxes. Mr. Stewart asked that a Town Hall Meeting be held so residents could talk about it more.

**Walt Bausman, 5792 S 1075 E** – pointed out that the information Mr. Stewart was referring to was in the Council's packet.

There were no other public comments.

### **III. RECOGNITION OF SCOUTS/STUDENTS PRESENT**

There were no scouts or students present.

### **IV. CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Approval Of February 5-6, 2016 Council Retreat Minutes**
- B. Approval Of March 1, 2016 Council Minutes**
- C. Approval Of February Warrants Register**
- D. Set Date For Special City Council Meeting On March 29, 2016**

The mayor read through the consent agenda and asked if there were any questions. Council Member Orr asked a few questions concerning items on the warrants register. There were no other questions. Mayor Minster called for a motion.

**Council Member Benard moved to approve the consent agenda, followed by a second from Council Member Porter. All present voted in favor of the motion.**

The consent agenda was approved.

### **V. DISCUSSION / ACTION ITEMS**

#### **A. Nomination And Election Of Mayor Pro Tempore**

The mayor turned the time over to City Attorney Bradshaw to introduce this item. Mr. Bradshaw said the Council, as the governing body, made a nomination for mayor pro tem and then voted on it. He reviewed several methods the Council had used over the past 30 years to elect or appoint a mayor pro tem, leaving the matter wide open as to how this Council wanted to go about it; they simply needed to decide what they wanted to do.

Council Member Orr asked several questions concerning the duties of the mayor pro tem, including if the mayor pro tem took over for the mayor if he stepped down for some reason. Mr. Bradshaw said that was true only if the mayor stepped down on a temporary basis, not if it was

permanent. Council Member Hensley asked if the term “vacancy” in the statute had been defined. Mr. Bradshaw stated that case law would have to be looked at to determine the definition.

Mayor Minster asked the Council how they wanted to do the nomination and election. Council Member Strate asked if they could make it a private ballot. Mr. Bradshaw said they could. The council discussed several methods of electing the mayor pro tem. Council Member Porter then made a motion:

**Council Member Porter moved to elect a mayor pro tem by the advice and consent of the Council for a name submitted by the mayor.** There was some discussion and clarification on the motion. Council Member Porter clarified that the mayor would submit a name for the mayor pro tem and the council would vote on it. **Council Member Benard seconded the motion. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.**

Mayor Minster submitted the name of Council Member Porter to act as mayor pro tem and called for a motion for the advice and consent of the Council.

**Council Member Benard moved to give advice and consent for the mayor’s proposed appointment, followed by a second from Council Member Porter.** The mayor asked if there was further discussion, and seeing none, he called a voice vote. **The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.**

The mayor then changed the seating order of the Council so the new mayor pro tem would be seated next to the mayor.

#### **B. Consideration Of Resolution 16-08 – Adopting The Weber County Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan**

Fire Chief Cameron West came forward to present this item. The chief reported that FEMA had approved the plan and it was now before the Council for their approval. Council Member Orr pointed out there was not a map for South Ogden at the end of the plan and she wondered if it had accidentally been left out. The chief said he would look into the matter.

Chief West informed the Council that being part of the plan would allow the City to apply for grant funding for things like bringing City owned buildings up to seismic code. There was no more discussion. The mayor called for a motion.

**Council Member Orr moved to adopt Resolution 16-08. Council Member Strate seconded the motion. The mayor called for further discussion and received no response. He then called the vote.**

<b>Council Member Orr -</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Council Member Strate -</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Council Member Benard -</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Council Member Porter -</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**Council Member Hensley- Yes**

Resolution 16-08 was adopted.

**C. Discussion On Town Hall Meetings**

The mayor turned the time to Council Member Hensley to lead this discussion. Mr. Hensley reminded the Council they had wanted to provide an opportunity where residents could speak to them. He and City Recorder Leesa Kapetanov had written down a list of what the Town Hall meeting might look like and included it in the packet. Council Member Hensley read through the list. The Council discussed varying aspects of the meeting, including where it should be held and the format of the meeting. They determined the first meeting would be held April 21 in the choir room of South Junior High. The meeting should allow for back and forth discussion so as to not be so formal, and the Council would be available after the meeting for one on one discussion. The suggestion was also made that people be given the opportunity to write their questions down and have them read to the Council.

**VI. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**A. Discussion On Ordinance 16-07 – Adopting The Form Based Code And Amending The Zoning Map In Conjunction With The Form Based Code**

City Manager Dixon informed the Council the Planning Commission had voted on a recommendation to the City Council concerning the Form Based Code (FBC) at their last meeting; however the recommendation lacked sufficient votes to move forward. It would be reconsidered at their next meeting. Staff had left the item on the agenda so the Council would have the opportunity to ask questions and familiarize themselves with the Code. Mr. Dixon also emphasized the fact that no matter what the Council thought or directed staff to look at concerning the FBC, it would not be forwarded to the Planning Commission so as not to influence their process. He then invited City Planner Mark Vlasic to come forward and answer any questions the Council might have.

Council Member Porter asked why the area for the FBC extended so far on both sides of 40<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Vlasic said the consultant hired to create the Code had two reasons for extending the area: 1) the current and increasing high volume of traffic on the road would necessitate prohibiting/limiting direct access off of 40<sup>th</sup>, therefore access from side streets needed to be facilitated. That meant that enough area needed to exist to accommodate a building and parking behind it, and 2) enough area needed to be provided in order that substantial and transformative uses would be able to be built. Mr. Vlasic also reminded the Council that the traffic along 40<sup>th</sup> would only grow larger over the next 20 years. Mr. Dixon added that the amount of traffic on the road made it increasingly less desirable for single family residences and increasingly desirable for commercial businesses. This Code would make sure the coming commercial development would be what the City wanted.

Council Member Orr said she felt comfortable with how 40<sup>th</sup> Street was laid out in the FBC, but she felt they had not studied or looked at the other areas like Washington Boulevard and Riverdale Road. Mr. Vlasic gave an overview of the other areas and what they allowed. He

pointed out that the FBC allowed mixed uses. Council Member Orr asked why the area did not extend to Wall on 36<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Vlasic said he would look into it.

Council Member Porter then asked Mr. Vlasic to give his opinion on the letter from McDonald's. Mr. Vlasic said McDonald's used the same model over and over because it had proved successful. The FBC did not encourage or allow a drive-thru, which was 60%-70% of their business, hence they did not like it. He pointed out the McDonald's in the area had recently remodeled, and there would not be any issues for quite a while since existing uses would be grandfathered into the FBC. Council Member Benard said he would like to contact McDonald's and have them specify what communities had rescinded their FBC as referred to in the letter. Mr. Benard also referred to the Marmalade neighborhood in Salt Lake City and said that was the transformation that South Ogden was looking for along 40<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Vlasic added Holladay was another example of that type of development.

Council Member Strate asked about Ogden's recent mixed use development in their downtown and if it was a form based code. Mr. Vlasic said it was his understanding that it was not, but that the zoning had strict guidelines and an extensive review process. Mr. Strate said he was concerned with allowing private roads in the FBC area. Mr. Vlasic said the engineer had also been concerned, however when he understood the upkeep of the private roads would be on the owner, he was okay with it. The private roads were most often alleys that allowed access to service entrances and parking that were now located behind buildings. Council Member Strate then commented there seemed to be a large amount of conditional uses in the code; he would rather they not exist at all. Mr. Vlasic said he was not worried about the conditional uses in the FBC, as there seemed to be so many other tools in the code to mitigate unwanted impacts.

The Council then requested that staff reach out to other cities in Utah that had adopted a FBC to see how it was working for them. There was no more discussion.

## **B. Discussion On Sidewalk Plans**

City Manager Dixon reported the city engineer had scaled back the original sidewalk plan that had been prepared for a grant application so that it did not include sidewalks for both sides of the street. The cost for the project had been \$265,000; the scaled back version would cost \$98,626. Chief Parke had suggested that the sidewalks be put on the east side of Jefferson and the north side of 4500 South in order to make the least amount of crossings needed for children to walk to school. Council Member Orr said there were fewer or no sidewalks to get the children to that point and children would be coming from both directions. She felt it was better the way the engineer had laid it out.

Mr. Dixon pointed out that although the City had applied for a Wasatch Regional Front grant for the sidewalks, if the City was awarded the grant it would not find out until August and the money would not be available until 2017. That would not allow the sidewalk to be installed before the beginning of the school year. If the Council wanted to move forward to have the sidewalk installed this year, staff would request the grant application be pulled from consideration. The Council would need to decide if they wanted to budget for the sidewalk and install it this year or wait and see if the City was awarded the grant and install it next year. Council Member Porter said his preference was for the City to pay for the sidewalks on Jefferson and 4500 South but seek

for the grant for the sidewalks along Burchcreek Drive. The rest of the Council agreed. City Manager Dixon said he would contact the school district to make sure the sidewalk was being placed in the right area to meet the needs of the students walking to the new school.

## **VII. DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR REPORTS**

### **A. Parks and Public Works Director Jon Andersen – Project Updates**

Mr. Andersen reported the City had not been awarded the CDBG grant it had applied for, but they would apply again for it in the future.

He then explained that the management of storm water was becoming more critical and staff was working on compliance and the application process to receive an MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System) permit. The EPA required that all cities have the permit and that it be renewed every 5 years. The Division of Water Quality enforced the permit by doing audits of the cities. Mr. Andersen thought that South Ogden would be audited soon. Staff was working with the engineer to be in compliance, however, he anticipated some costs to be incurred to become compliant and receive the permit.

### **B. Assistant to the City Manager Doug Gailey – Passport Services**

Mr. Gailey said staff had been looking into what it would take to provide passport services at City Hall. He had made a tentative application to the State Department and had received tentative approval. Mr. Gailey explained the process people would go through to apply for a passport. He said that additional staff would not need to be hired immediately. There were currently 3 other places in the area that offered passport services: the Ogden Main Post Office, which was 6 miles away; the Weber County Clerk's Office, which was 6 miles away, and the Layton post office, which was also 6 miles away. The start-up fee would cost the City approximately \$900; however the City would receive \$25 per processed packet plus any additional money from the photos. It would take between 25 to 36 applications to break even and the City would always have the option to discontinue the service if it felt it wasn't working.

City Manager Dixon said had received recommendations from other cities that offering passport services was an easy way to generate some revenue. The consensus of the Council was that staff should move forward with the process so the City could offer passport services.

## **VIII. COUNCIL REPORTS**

### **A. Mayor – thanked Mr. Benard for acting as the mayor pro tem for the past year.**

He then informed the Council the recent switch to a different program at the Weber County Dispatch had gone fairly well.

The mayor concluded by reporting he had recently attended a meeting hosted by Weber State University. The university was glad for the partnerships it had with various cities, and would be happy to look into more partnerships.

**B. City Council Members**

**City Council Member Hensley** – reported that former council member and architect Thair Blackburn had passed away.

**Council Member Orr** – asked if the City was planning to participate in the “Shakeout”. Chief West said they were planning on it.

Ms. Orr then pointed to an article in *The View* magazine, which was mostly about South Ogden’s Easter Egg Hunt and which extensively quoted former Events Coordinator Jill McCullough.

She also made comments concerning: a company that could review the website and give recommendations, the need to pay attention to changes Ogden was making to their Good Landlord Program, and information on the Weber Mosquito Abatement website about the Zika virus. She also said there had been issues with the new manager of the Ogden Airport trying to limit the mosquito abatement planes flying out of the airport.

**Council Member Porter** – thanked the mayor for his trust in becoming the mayor pro tem. He also commended staff for their transparency on the website as noted in a recent newspaper article.

**Council Member Strate** – noticed that Washington Terrace notices a public meeting when their council goes to the Utah League of Cities and Towns and wondered if South Ogden should also do it.

Mr. Strate also asked staff for some information on what had happened in the Fox Chase area concerning the ponds and what the residents had been promised and what the City could do to assist. He also asked to look at the landscape design for the area along 5600 South that the City owned. He then informed the Council the residents along Park Vista were having a meeting concerning the city owned property in the area.

He concluded his statements by voicing his concerns about the various speed limits along Glasmann Avenue. He wondered if it should just be kept one speed the whole way. He also wondered if there was new technology to replace the mirror that had been installed but that was constantly damaged by vandals. The mirror helped motorists to see oncoming traffic.

**Council Member Benard** – had discussed with Superintendent Jeff Stephens the property where the old South Junior High had been located. He felt both the school district and the City had the same vision for the property.

**C. City Manager** – reported that Dan McDonald was scheduled to come and speak with the Council on April 19 in a work session. Also, Weber County would be at the same meeting to report on the Skyline Drive Road Project.

He then asked if it was the Council’s intent to revisit the Fox Chase park project. The Council discussed it. Mr. Dixon said he would put it on the next agenda to see where it fell within the strategic plan and budget.

Mr. Dixon then asked if staff should do anything about the speed limit on Glasmann. The consensus of the Council was that nothing should be done.



**D. City Attorney Ken Bradshaw** – nothing to report.

## **IX. ADJOURN CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND CONVENE INTO A WORK SESSION**

Mayor Minster said it was time to adjourn the city council meeting and convene into a work session and called for a motion to do so.

**At 8:31 pm, Council Member Porter moved to adjourn city council and move into a work session, followed by a second from Council Member Strate. Everyone present voted aye,**

Note: The Council took a short break and moved into the EOC for the work session. All members of the Council were present for the work session which began at 8:44 pm.

### **A. Discussion on Strategic Plan**

City Manager Dixon emphasized how important the strategic plan was as a guide; it would help the Council determine what they wanted to accomplish and aid staff in helping to accomplish it. He handed the Council a copy of the strategic plan (see Attachment A) and began reviewing it. They reviewed each strategic directive and made sure they created goals for each to accomplish what they wanted. They discussed such topics as code enforcement, working with other agencies, an employee satisfaction survey, employee team building, a business satisfaction survey, and economic development. The following pointes on the strategic plan were added or changed:

- 1.2 Map out process (flowchart) and give to council
- 1.5 Rebranding
- 1.6 Park properties
- 2.1 Code enforcement, Building permits, projects
- 3.1 Visit agencies we impact by our work to learn, understand. only
- 3.3 Communication efficiencies- track interlocal agreements
- 4.1 Complete employee satisfaction survey
- Put 4.4 under 4.1
- 4.2 - utilize employee recognition program
- put 4.5 under 4.2
- 5.1 business survey/feedback
- 5.2 business visit by council/staff
- 5.3 economic development efforts

Council Member Strate pointed out they could add lots of projects to the strategic plan, but if there was not enough money to do them, it didn't make a difference. Mr. Dixon agreed, saying the Council would have to decide what things were their highest priorities, and then fund them first.



City Manager Dixon then asked the Council for some more direction to staff in cutting a million dollars from the budget. Council Member Strate said he didn't want to give too much direction so staff would have all options open. Mr. Dixon said staff could come up with unlimited options, but needed to know what the Council's priorities were. Services would have to be cut and the Council needed to give direction on what core governmental functions and services they wanted the City to provide. Mr. Strate said he wanted staff to be innovative and think out of the box about ways to cut money. City Manager Dixon said a million dollars was far beyond finding inefficiencies here and there and correcting them. The Council would need to decide things like what the city's core services should be; if it was fire and police, then staff would drastically reduce parks and recreation and/or drop any plans to build and maintain streets. If the Council said they wanted to cut a million dollars from the budget, but still provide all the services it was currently providing, then staff would work toward shrinking all staff with the expectation that the level of services provided would greatly be reduced. Council Member Hensley said he was not as concerned with cutting a million dollars as he was with potential liabilities for unfunded projects that would be coming due in the future. He also said if the Council was going to ask residents for \$7.50 more per month on water fees and/or property taxes, he wanted to be able to say the City had stream lined wherever they could. He suggested Mr. Dixon give them a list of projects and have them prioritize them, so staff would know where to start cutting. Council Member Strate quoted some statistics, saying the City had been treading water for 6-7 years, but now needed more revenue to get everything done that needed it.

City Manager Dixon said the Council would have to have some difficult conversations to address some very real issues and decide in what direction they wanted to take the City. They would have to cut services or raise revenue.

Mr. Dixon then asked if there were any items that needed to be included in the strategic plan that had not been added; nothing was brought up. There was no more discussion.

## **X. ADJOURN WORK SESSION**

**Council Member Porter moved to adjourn the work session, followed by a second from Council Member Strate. The voice vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.**

The work session concluded at 10:31 pm.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete record of the South Ogden City Council Meeting held Tuesday, March 15, 2016.

  
Leesa Kapetanov, City Recorder

Date Approved by the City Council \_\_\_\_\_ April 19, 2016

**Attachment A**  
Handouts from Mr. Stewart

Reasons that Residents are opposed to Form Based Code:

1. Taxes for residents will increase as surrounding commercial property values increase.
2. City has not informed residents with sufficient time of the planned zoning changes.
3. Development could happen next to any residential home within the Form Based Code Zone.
4. Commercial Parking Lots would replace residential lots with only a 5' landscape buffer.
5. There would be more commercial traffic along local residential streets.
6. Increased traffic would make it more unsafe for children living in Form Based Code Zones.
7. The Form Based Code is not being implemented fairly across our city.
8. Implementing two zoning codes will cost our city money that could be better spent otherwise.
9. There are currently many existing commercial properties that do not have tenants, why more?
10. This is not good for families or the residents living in the affected areas.
11. Form based code puts building form as more important than allowed uses.
12. There is less citizen input allowed in the approval process of development.
13. Form based code will make more hot black asphalt surfaces and less green landscaped areas so this is not environmentally friendly.
14. Schools in the nearby area to the 40<sup>th</sup> street upgrades were not contacted by our city.
15. Adding more commercial traffic along 40<sup>th</sup> street will defeat the purpose of widening 40<sup>th</sup> street to alleviate congestion.
16. South Ogden City has listened more to City Manager, City Planner & Zion's bank as to what it thinks is good for economic growth and development – who are not residents of our city or to the residents living in the area?
17. When Form Based Code was introduced to city Council only Washington Blvd. and 40<sup>th</sup> street were being considered as was told to City Council by the City Manager. It has grown to areas that are not a part of the approved 2008 general plan.
18. The 2008 general plan stated that residents in the south wanted more commercial development and affordable housing near them, so why is it being proposed in the North part of our city?
19. The need for a city center was listed as a 3.2 (basically neutral), so why spend taxpayer money on something residents don't feel strongly that our city needs?
20. Citizen input was not sought after in an open public meeting where residents could freely speak and have a back and forth dialogue with city Manager and Planner. They have only fielded questions and answered only a few of the resident's questions.
21. Not clear what street sections will look like, how new street sections will be implemented, safety concerns of residents regarding smaller streets have not been addressed.
22. How will new infrastructure required for potentially more residents be constructed and who will be required to make the new infrastructure updates to roads, sewer lines, water lines, etc.?
23. This is only an "Opportunity" for developers. The more poor people living in the area will get either bought out or forced out of their homes by construction & increased property taxes.
24. No one in our city has experience implementing Form Based Code.
25. How will keeping up this Form Based Code be paid for by taxpayers going forward?
26. Low income people live primarily in the affected proposed Form Based Code rezone areas. It has been shown that implementing Form Based Code raises property values which I can see the city would want for generating more of a tax base and commercial and multiple buildings on a single lot does the same. What about lower income people who may not be able to afford to pay their increase property taxes? They will be the victims if commercial development expands.

Weber Country - Tax History from 2-9-2016  
 = Voting City Member

\* Denotes values entered in after home was constructed at a date after 1990.  
 NA=No tax records prior (either newer development or tax records were not available)

Current Owner	Address	Property Charges				7 YR				Taxable Values			7 YR			
		1990	2008	2016	Change	Change	Change	Change	Change	1990	2008	2015	Change	Change	Change	Change
A&M Prop Mngt.	1550 E 6250 S	\$687	\$1,282	\$1,140	-\$142	-11%	87%	66%		\$39,350	\$98,080	\$75,530	-\$22,550	-23%	149%	92%
Johnson*	6067 S 1150 E	\$1,907	\$2,312	\$2,332	\$20	1%	21%	22%		\$126,923	\$176,000	\$153,594	-\$22,406	-13%	39%	21%
Nagai*	1255 E 6000 S	\$1,171	\$1,367	\$1,553	\$186	14%	17%	33%		\$80,333	\$104,830	\$104,466	-\$364	0%	30%	30%
Strate*	5999 S Park Vista Dr	NA	\$2,103	\$3,621	\$1,518	72%	NA	NA		NA	\$263,450	\$247,500	-\$15,950	-6%	NA	NA
Randall*	5898 S Main Point E	\$1,150	\$2,488	\$2,151	-\$337	-14%	116%	87%		\$82,183	\$192,385	\$144,347	-\$48,038	-25%	134%	76%
Kennedy	5832 Cedar Ln	\$615	\$1,022	\$1,026	\$4	0%	66%	67%		\$35,050	\$77,435	\$67,611	-\$9,824	-13%	121%	93%
Price	5832 Cedar Ln	\$621	\$1,003	\$1,063	\$60	6%	62%	71%		\$35,450	\$75,933	\$70,199	-\$5,734	-8%	114%	98%
Hansen	5841 S Cedar Ln	\$625	\$940	\$1,033	\$93	10%	50%	65%		\$35,650	\$70,946	\$68,107	-\$2,839	-4%	99%	91%
Votava	5785 S 1075 E	\$1,436	\$2,094	\$2,209	\$115	5%	46%	54%		\$84,075	\$161,986	\$149,563	-\$12,423	-8%	93%	78%
Cottrell	5765 S 1075 E	\$1,616	\$2,537	\$2,956	\$419	17%	57%	83%		\$94,650	\$196,276	\$200,655	\$4,379	2%	107%	112%
Merlin Bingham	5772 S 1075 E	\$1,469	\$2,061	\$2,006	-\$55	-3%	40%	37%		\$99,611	\$158,527	\$134,195	-\$24,332	-15%	59%	35%
Hamilton *	1061 E 5750 S	\$1,734	\$2,363	\$2,134	-\$229	-10%	36%	23%		\$99,322	\$182,489	\$143,157	-\$39,332	-22%	84%	44%
Bryce	5697 S Mapplewoor	\$835	\$1,199	\$1,516	\$317	26%	44%	82%		\$48,030	\$90,684	\$99,629	\$8,945	10%	89%	107%
Ludeen*	5688 S 1150 E	\$1,968	\$2,797	\$2,810	\$13	0%	42%	43%		\$140,702	\$216,066	\$189,275	-\$26,791	-12%	54%	35%
Mayor Minster	5685 Maplewood D	\$843	\$689	\$76	-\$613	-89%	-18%	-91%		\$48,500	\$94,397	\$98,138	\$3,741	4%	95%	102%
Hepworth*	5680 S 1150 E	\$1,666	\$2,904	\$2,650	-\$254	-9%	74%	59%		\$123,700	\$224,817	\$176,640	-\$48,177	-21%	82%	43%
Medrano	5661 S Mapplewoor	\$831	\$1,268	\$1,650	\$382	30%	53%	99%		\$47,850	\$96,179	\$110,111	\$13,932	14%	101%	130%
Benard*	5604 S Foxchase Dr	NA	\$2,832	\$2,680	-\$152	-5%	NA	NA		NA	\$188,290	\$179,461	-\$8,829	-5%	NA	NA
Bradley*	802 S Heights Cir	NA	NA	\$2,740	NA	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	\$170,084	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hensley	820 Oak Dr	\$763	\$1,288	\$1,596	\$308	24%	69%	109%		\$40,141	\$87,945	\$91,273	\$3,328	4%	119%	127%
Torghele	900 Oak Dr	\$1,907	\$3,297	\$3,569	\$272	8%	73%	87%		\$120,385	\$255,750	\$242,334	-\$13,416	-5%	112%	101%
Kapetanov	5136 S Sunset Ln	\$902	\$1,318	\$1,410	\$92	7%	46%	56%		\$50,050	\$92,950	\$79,296	-\$13,654	-15%	86%	58%
Northern Total Average		\$1,226	\$1,894	\$2,037	\$143	8%	55%	66%		\$77,367	\$150,367	\$139,030	-\$11,337	-8%	94%	80%
Heslop	4999 Sunset Ln	\$860	\$1,546	\$1,768	\$222	14%	80%	106%		\$47,300	\$109,450	\$101,731	-\$7,719	-7%	131%	115%
Orr	4693 Maddison Ave	\$1,373	\$1,776	\$2,196	\$420	24%	29%	60%		\$77,500	\$127,243	\$130,875	\$3,632	3%	64%	69%
Webb	4629 Maddison Ave	\$1,213	\$2,030	\$2,423	\$393	19%	67%	100%		\$76,751	\$150,246	\$151,533	\$1,287	1%	96%	97%
Wilde	4299 Gramercy	\$561	\$928	\$1,188	\$260	28%	65%	112%		\$29,950	\$62,865	\$65,225	\$2,360	4%	110%	118%
Quigley	865 E 4300 S	\$582	\$1,139	\$1,188	\$49	4%	96%	104%		\$33,000	\$84,920	\$74,033	-\$10,887	-13%	157%	124%
Porter	625 E 4300 S	\$537	\$1,231	\$1,691	\$460	37%	129%	215%		\$28,650	\$87,347	\$101,102	\$13,755	16%	205%	253%
Layton	4282 Porter Ave	\$706	\$1,096	\$1,396	\$300	27%	55%	98%		\$38,400	\$75,460	\$78,523	\$3,063	4%	97%	104%
Pruess*	785 41st St	\$659	\$1,621	\$2,195	\$574	35%	146%	233%		\$42,752	\$113,869	\$129,109	\$15,240	13%	166%	202%
Central Total Average		\$811	\$1,421	\$1,756	\$335	24%	75%	116%		\$46,788	\$101,425	\$104,016	\$2,591	3%	117%	122%

Weber Country - Tax History from 2-9-2016

\* Denotes values entered in after home was constructed at a date after 1990.

NA=No tax records prior (either newer development or tax records were not available)

		Property Charges				7 YR	7 YR %	19 YR %	26 YR %	Taxable Values			7 YR	7 YR %	19 YR %	26 YR %			
Current Owner	Address	1990	2008	2016	Change	Change	Change	Change	Change	1990	2008	2016	Change	Change	Change	Change			
Cove on 40th St*	423 W Lakeview Dr	NA	\$449	\$440	-\$9	-2%	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$0	0%	NA	NA			
40th St Properties	3382 W 1000 N	\$832	\$1,807	\$1,708	-\$99	-5%	117%	105%	\$43,900	\$123,008	\$89,074	-\$33,934	-28%	180%	103%				
Ropelato	535 40th Street	\$256	\$899	\$1,134	\$235	26%	251%	343%	\$23,600	\$60,782	\$61,787	\$1,005	2%	158%	162%				
Gardner	555 40th Street	\$442	\$952	\$1,194	\$242	25%	115%	170%	\$22,900	\$64,969	\$65,995	\$1,026	2%	184%	188%				
Waldron	3755 Orchard	\$694	\$1,285	\$1,585	\$300	23%	85%	128%	\$37,400	\$89,595	\$90,319	\$724	1%	140%	141%				
Bours	3647 Orchard	\$328	\$998	\$1,260	\$262	26%	204%	284%	\$17,700	\$73,480	\$78,619	\$5,139	7%	315%	344%				
Gaffney*	3646 Orchard	\$1,104	\$1,472	\$2,130	\$658	45%	33%	93%	\$80,253	\$106,260	\$131,428	\$25,168	24%	32%	64%				
Kapp	3621 Orchard	\$495	\$987	\$1,178	\$191	19%	99%	138%	\$26,050	\$67,775	\$64,816	-\$2,959	-4%	160%	149%				
Taylor	4020 Jefferson Ave	\$435	\$1,670	\$2,058	\$388	23%	284%	373%	\$59,800	\$117,233	\$118,632	\$1,399	1%	96%	98%				
Hess	3761 Jefferson	\$425	\$748	\$1,091	\$343	46%	76%	157%	\$20,650	\$45,045	\$52,608	\$7,563	17%	118%	155%				
Valdivia	3757 Jefferson	\$651	\$927	\$1,310	\$383	41%	42%	101%	\$38,950	\$62,851	\$73,858	\$11,007	18%	61%	90%				
Hill	3651 Jefferson	\$449	\$747	\$1,056	\$309	41%	66%	135%	\$23,350	\$48,703	\$56,329	\$7,626	16%	109%	141%				
Guzman	3650 Jefferson	\$370	\$935	\$1,145	\$210	22%	153%	209%	\$17,550	\$60,555	\$57,397	-\$3,158	-5%	245%	227%				
Stewart	3265 Jefferson	\$511	\$873	\$1,381	\$508	58%	71%	170%	\$25,850	\$55,200	\$73,193	\$17,993	33%	114%	183%				
Campbell	3605 Jefferson	\$388	\$695	\$935	\$240	35%	79%	141%	\$19,700	\$44,564	\$47,857	\$3,293	7%	126%	143%				
Loyd	3602 Jefferson	\$511	\$1,021	\$1,205	\$184	18%	100%	136%	\$27,050	\$70,455	\$66,758	-\$3,697	-5%	160%	147%				
Cano	3601 Jefferson	\$415	\$683	\$1,012	\$329	48%	65%	144%	\$20,700	\$43,601	\$53,241	\$9,640	22%	111%	157%				
Martin*	3660 Porter	NA	\$779	\$1,261	\$482	62%	NA	NA	NA	\$51,501	\$70,568	\$19,067	37%	NA	NA				
Miller*	3650 Porter	NA	\$809	\$1,382	\$573	71%	NA	NA	NA	\$60,734	\$76,776	\$16,042	26%	NA	NA				
Hartzog	3610 Porter	\$554	\$837	\$1,104	\$267	32%	51%	99%	\$29,700	\$54,766	\$60,023	\$5,257	10%	84%	102%				
Nelson	3829 Adams	\$508	\$792	\$1,021	\$229	29%	56%	101%	\$26,550	\$51,446	\$52,424	\$978	2%	94%	97%				
Pruess	3735 Adams	\$419	\$921	\$1,311	\$390	42%	120%	213%	\$21,550	\$62,611	\$74,322	\$11,711	19%	191%	245%				
McCracken	3697 Adams	\$340	\$916	\$1,253	\$337	37%	169%	269%	\$16,900	\$62,418	\$70,649	\$8,231	13%	269%	318%				
Higgs	3881 Ogden	\$550	\$936	\$1,296	\$360	38%	70%	136%	\$29,374	\$63,814	\$73,299	\$9,485	15%	117%	150%				
Richards	3880 Ogden	\$643	\$1,173	\$1,379	\$206	18%	82%	114%	\$34,800	\$82,198	\$78,386	-\$3,812	-5%	136%	125%				
Hansen	3850 Ogden	\$576	\$787	\$990	\$203	26%	37%	72%	\$30,953	\$73,872	\$77,072	\$3,200	4%	139%	149%				
Van Aifen	3811 Ogden	\$420	\$715	\$932	\$217	30%	70%	122%	\$21,600	\$46,248	\$47,835	\$1,587	3%	114%	121%				
Campbell*	437 37th Street	NA	\$833	\$950	\$117	14%	NA	NA	NA	\$41,917	\$49,159	\$7,242	17%	NA	NA				
Donnelson	583 36th Street	\$794	\$1,020	\$1,528	\$508	50%	28%	92%	\$43,800	\$73,439	\$88,582	\$15,143	21%	68%	102%				
Northern Total Average		\$524	\$954	\$1,249	\$295	31%	82%	138%	\$30,425	\$65,139	\$70,035	\$4,895	8%	114%	130%				
Summary:																			
Northern Total Average		\$524	\$954	\$1,249	\$295	31%	82%	138%	\$30,425	\$65,139	\$70,035	\$4,895	8%	114%	130%				
Central Total Average		\$811	\$1,421	\$1,756	\$335	24%	75%	116%	\$46,788	\$101,425	\$104,016	\$2,591	3%	117%	122%				
Southern Total Average		\$1,226	\$1,894	\$2,037	\$143	8%	55%	66%	\$77,367	\$150,367	\$139,030	-\$11,337	-8%	94%	80%				
Net Change North to South Difference						\$152	23%	27%	72%	\$16,232							15%	20%	50%
Net Change Central to South Difference						\$192	16%	21%	50%	\$13,928							10%	22%	43%

Difference North has outperformed the South = 50%  
Difference Central has outperformed the South = 43%



**7 year conclusions based on this snapshot of properties**

\$152 more increase in property charges for Northern residents compared to the Southern residents.

Residents in the north part of our city are paying \$192 more increase in property charges compared to residents in the South are paying.

Residential properties in the north part of our city taxable value on their homes have increased an average of \$4,895.

Residential properties in the south part of our city taxable value on their homes have decreased an average of \$11,337.

Residential properties in the north part of our city have outperformed other regions by as much as \$16,232 = (\$4,895 - -\$13,928)

Residential properties in the north part of our city have outperformed the southern homes by \$16,232, 15% greater property value and taxable value has increased by 50% more

**7 years was looked at due to the last general report from South Ogden City is dated 2008.**

What has our country been through economically since our city's 2008 report? (Economic Recession)

Which residents or our city were most adversely affected with loss of employment during the economic recession? (The Northern Residents)

**26 year conclusions based on this snapshot of properties**

The northern R-2 properties have had the highest increase in South Ogden City for the taxable value on their homes averaging 130%.

The 130% increase is slightly higher than the central region at 122% and both central and northern regions are much higher than Southern areas of our city at only 50%.

The residents of all South Ogden City Properties should be looked at to get more concise report for our city.

Would South Ogden City be willing to have this data gathered and gathered data and information made publically aware to all residents?

In the original 2008 report, the street Ogden Avenue was listed as the lowest valued properties in our city (most affordable housing).

Why are they the lowest valued residential properties in our city? Maybe being next to commercial Washington Blvd. is not a desirable residential location.

Is South Ogden City being fair and just to all of its residents? If so, why not allow FBC in all zones? Or don't mandate FBC at all?

If the goal is truly to provide for housing to meet forecasted Wasatch Front Regional Council Growth, our city may need this in all residential areas.

There are no guarantees that Form Based Code housing will actually form more residential housing? (It could be 100% commercial next to residential)

Is our city no longer abiding by Utah State Law in regards to the "Affordable Housing Act"?

Is the way FBC is being considered by our city "Justice for All" (including the R-2 residents)? I think NO and not for any resident in our city.

If our city can implement new zoning affecting hundreds of residents without asking the affected residents for their input in the proposed plan prior to proposing it, than our city really (safe from living next to commercial development) for any resident living in any zoned residential area.

According to the WFR, FBC will make residents property values and taxes go up even more. Not a good thing for a regular resident.

It is primarily because of the potential for getting more economic revenue for our city that large areas of residential homes are being included with the proposed rezone area. There is no guarantee of economic returns for anyone and the residents living in the affected areas will be the losers of the deal.

Is this really Justice for All? This is like starting a marathon, knowing who the opponent is and then start running without letting the opponent know other than saying, we published the race in the paper that few people read and on the city website briefly before the race was started.

Residents in the R-2 Zone were only given a weeks notice and told only that their zoning area is being proposed to change zones.

How fair is that being that the FBC is 107 pages of technical wording and they were given this over Superbowl Sunday weekend.

Planning commissioners voted to close public comment and table until next monthing voting on the adoption of FBC.

There is still no final version of the FBC only Draft. South Ogden City's Website is labeled Draft 2016, which implies a final version is pending.

The FBC states widths of the new neighborhood street sections should be which are not compatible with existing residential street widths. Why?

There are still many family unfriendly business uses that are allowed in many residential areas that need to be addressed by city council (or voted down).

**Attachment B**  
Strategic Plan



## South Ogden Mayor and City Council 2015

### Goals & Action Plans

**Matt**  
Matt Dixon

Strategic Directives Goals Action Plans Tasks	Owner	Resources (people, budget, equipment)	Target Finish	Update (and additional detail)	% Complete
<b>1. Towards Residents: To enhance, protect &amp; preserve the quality of life for residents.</b>					
1.1 The city will create a Transportation Improvement Plan that will include city streets, trails, bike lanes, and sidewalks. The plan will focus on short term needs - bringing current facilities up to acceptable standards and long term needs - maintenance & funding.	Jon Andersen	City Engineer, Matt, Adam, Brent, Trans. Fee, Study, GF Allocations for Streets	6/30/2016		0%
1.2 We will make demonstrable improvements to the City's Code Enforcement efforts.	Darin Parke	Officer Bailey, Sallee, Possible Budget Impacts	12/31/2016 <i>Completed</i>		100%
1.3 We will identify and make necessary updates to important city codes.	Matt Dixon	Mark Vlasic, Leesa, Doug, Brent	1/31/2017		0%
1.4 We will make demonstrable improvements in our understanding of the public's wants, needs & desires, as measured by public input gathered at meetings, through surveys & other means. (focus is on information gathering, communication of all forms, etc.)	Select Owner		12/31/2016		0%
<b>2. Toward City Council: To be sufficiently inform in order to make decisions that are best for the city.</b>					
2.1 Provide list of code enforcement problems	Darin Parke	Matt	6/30/2016		0%
2.2 Provide a feedback mechanism	Matt Dixon	Department Heads, Bryan Benard	6/30/2016		0%
<b>3. Toward Agencies: To establish and maintain good relationships that provide mutually beneficial goods and services between agencies.</b>					
3.1 Make list of agencies and ask what we can do for them	Matt Dixon		12/31/2016		0%
3.2 Finalize negotiations with county for fire services	Cameron West	Matt	9/30/2016		0%
3.3 Communication efficiencies	Leesa Kapetanov	Department Heads, Ken	12/31/2016		0%
<b>4. Toward Employees: To preserve and enhance employee satisfaction.</b>					
4.1 Conduct an Employee Satisfaction Survey	Doug Gailey		9/30/2016		0%
4.2 Fix wage inequities	Doug Gailey	Department Heads, City Council	7/31/2016		0%
4.3 Conduct Benefits Analysis	Doug Gailey		7/31/2016		0%
4.4 Employee recognitions - find what works best	Doug Gailey	Matt, Department Heads	12/31/2016		0%
4.5 Innovation Award (between departments and individuals)	Matt Dixon	Bryan	12/31/2016		0%

4.6 Training, Innovation, Team-building day	Matt Dixon	Bryan, Doug, Departments	12/31/2016	0%
5. Towards Businesses: To provide services and support that enable businesses to be successful.				

Page Generated in 0 seconds. Q=26. Q/S=0.00 - Logged In As: Matt Dixon (24299) | [test](#)